

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA §  
§  
vs. § NO: WA:18-CR-00291(1)-ADA  
§  
(1) JAMES ARTHUR WILLIAMS §

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION** .  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the court is the above styled and numbered cause. On June 11, 2025 the United States Probation Office filed a Petition For Warrant or Summons For Offender Under Supervision for Defendant (1) JAMES ARTHUR WILLIAMS, which alleged that Williams violated a condition of his supervised release and recommended that Williams's supervised release be revoked (Clerk's Document No. 49). A warrant issued and Williams was arrested. On June 13, 2025, Williams appeared before a United States Magistrate Judge, was ordered detained, and a revocation of supervised release hearing was set.

Williams appeared before the magistrate judge on July 1, 2025, waived his right to a preliminary hearing and to be present before the United States District Judge at the time of modification of sentence, and consented to allocution before the magistrate judge.

Following the hearing, the magistrate judge signed his report and recommendation on July 2, 2025, which provides that having carefully considered all of the arguments and evidence presented by the Government and Defendant, based on the original offense and

the intervening conduct of Williams, the magistrate judge recommends that this court revoke Williams supervised release and that Williams be sentenced to imprisonment for NINE (9) months, with no term supervised release to follow the term of imprisonment, and that he be given credit for the time he has been in federal custody (Clerk's Document No. 64).

A party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation, and thereby secure a *de novo* review by the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). A party's failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation in a report and recommendation bars that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*). The parties in this cause were properly notified of the consequences of a failure to file objections.


On July 1, 2025, following the hearing on the motion to revoke supervised release, all parties signed a Waiver Of Fourteen Day Rule For Filing Objections To Report and Recommendation Of United States Magistrate Judge (Clerk's Document No. 63). The court, having reviewed the entire record and finding no plain error, accepts and adopts the report and recommendation filed in this cause.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge filed in this cause (Clerk's Document No. 64 ) is hereby ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED by this court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant (1) JAMES ARTHUR WILLIAMS's term of supervised release is hereby REVOKED.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant (1) JAMES ARTHUR WILLIAMS be imprisoned for NINE (9) months with no term of supervised release and he shall be given credit for the time he has been in federal custody.

Signed this 3rd day of July, 2025.



\_\_\_\_\_  
ALAN D ALBRIGHT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE